



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,959	08/22/2003	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010819US2	8404
34533 7590 01/27/2009 INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF) c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP P.O. BOX 1469 AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,959

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

HEMANT PATEL

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 13-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 13-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's submission filed on December 4, 2008 in response to Office Action dated September 5, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-4, 6, 13-17 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. **Regarding claims 1-4, 6, 13-17**, the Applicant has made general arguments (Remarks, pgs. 12-13) with regards to factual inquiries with respect to *Graham vs. John Deer Co.* citing "Graham factors: (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, and (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art", and "In particular in this case, the Examiner has not ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue. In the office action, the Examiner has only identified elements in Applicants' claims not found in one reference and then attempted to find a similar element in another to support an obviousness rejection.", "Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue requires interpreting the claim language, and considering both the invention and the prior art references as a whole.", "Furthermore, "[i]n determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious."" The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The

Applicant has made a broad generalized allegations but has not identified any particular claim or claim limitation for which these factual inquires were not performed. The Office Action clearly indicated the scope and content of the prior art as it applied to claimed limitations (limitations taught by Farris), the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art (the limitations not taught by the prior art reference i.e. what Farris does not specifically teach). With regards to "as a whole" obviousness, the claimed invention is an external server providing authentication of a caller identity of a caller calling from a telephone at a trusted telephone network, this authentication is initiated by the trusted telephone network by brokering connection to this external server, and the authenticated identity specifies services available to the caller. Farris clearly teaches of receiving a call from a caller calling from a telephone to central office (trusted telephone network), central office brokers connection to an external server (IP), external server (IP) performs authentication and provides authenticated identity to central office and this identity specifies the services available to the caller. Farris teaches all the limitations but the Applicant had argued about the IP as an external server. For this Office has shown Bajwa that teaches of using an external server for authenticating caller identity wherein the caller using the telephone makes a call through central office (trusted telephone network), the connection from caller through central office is brokered to an external server (feature platform) which performs caller identity authentication and this authenticated identity specifies the services available to the caller. Thus, both Farris and Bajwa as a whole teach the similar inventions obvious as claimed by the applicant.

4. Further, regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art, the Applicant has made general arguments (Remarks, pg. 13) "The examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and not to the inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand", and for this the Applicant further states that "Factors that may be considered in determining level of ordinary skill in the art include (1) the educational level of the inventor; (2) type of problems encountered in the art; (3) prior art solutions to those problems; (4) rapidity with which innovations are made; (5) sophistication of the technology; and (6) educational level of active workers in the field." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has indicated exclusion of "inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand" as one of ordinary skill in the art, but the Applicant has not identified who is actually included in the list of one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, regarding the factors listed to determine the one of ordinary skill in the art, the Applicant has not specified the necessary information, i.e. specific education levels required for the inventor and workers in the field, the scale of rapidity with which innovations are made, or the level of sophistication of the technology.

5. The Supreme Court in *KSR International co. v. Teleflex Inc.* has stated that "A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton.", "Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle.", "...inventions in

most, if not all, instances rely upon building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will be combinations of what, in some sense, is already known.”, “The obviousness analysis cannot be confined by a formalistic conception of the words teaching, suggestion, and motivation, or by overemphasis on the importance of published articles and the explicit content of issued patents. The diversity of inventive pursuits and of modern technology counsels against limiting the analysis in this way.”, “When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In that instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under §103.”, and “There is flexibility in our obviousness jurisprudence because a motivation may be found implicitly in the prior art. We do not have a rigid test that requires an actual teaching to combine . . .”. In the instant case, Farris and Bajwa have explicitly taught these pieces of puzzle and Bajwa further explicitly specified the motivation for an external server “to provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) since “It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-4, 6, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris (US Patent No. 6,122,357), and further in view of Bajwa (US Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0058787 A1), and further in view of Oliver (US Patent No. 7,305,550 B2), and further in view of Bassenyemukasa (US Patent No. 5,623,539).

Regarding claim 1, Farris teaches of a method for specifying telephone services for a particular caller, comprising:

detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 18, ll. 8-14);

brokering a connection between said origin device and an external server enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5, switch brokering connection between off hook line and IP), wherein brokering a connection further comprises:

transmitting a request for said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 16-40, SCP instructing IP);

transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway, to said origin device (col. 19, ll. 41-43);

transferring a voice utterance by said caller through said media gateway to said network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 43-46); and

receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (col. 20, ll. 14-22);

responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant had relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and

speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of a media gateway supporting Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), and also does not teach of automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of communication, Bajwa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 call received through central office); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); transmitting a request for said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for

accessing said external server (Paragraph 0018 gatekeeper signaling gateway to connect to external feature server for authentication); transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), to said origin device (Paragraph 0019 gateway transferring prompt from feature server to caller, Paragraph 0021 gateway supporting SIP); receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0023 validating caller); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) to provide various services based on user or user device authentication).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to "provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

The Applicant has argued that gateway in Bajwa does not transfer voice utterance by the caller. However, it was known in the art that media gateways were used to transfer voice or audio by converting between its coding protocols i.e. pulse code modulation (PCM) or analog voice for public switched telephone network (PSTN) from and/or to real time transport protocol (RTP) voice packet data for Internet.

However, in the same field of communication, Oliver teaches of providing authentication service by connecting a device user in PSTN (Fig. 1 items 28, 30, col. 4 ll. 51-54, col. 16 ll. 14-24) to an external authentication server (AS) in Internet (Fig. 1 item 18, col. 4 ll. 21-27, ll. 30-36) through a media gateway (Fig. 1 items 10, 11, col. 4 ll. 37-51) that pass the voice data between PSTN and Internet (col. 4 ll. 61-col. 5 ll. 7, col. 5 ll. 21-38, ll. 49-52, col. 6 ll. 53-col. 7 ll. 8) for Biometric authentication by the authentication server (col. 8 ll. 48-col. 9 ll. 59, col. 11 ll. 23-48, server performing same functionality of verification and authentication as that by client device i.e. verify the identity of the current telephone user i.e. caller col. 11 ll. 3-18, ll. 40-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with a media gateway and external server arrangement to pass media from user device to the authentication server as taught by Oliver in order to support various coding schemes for voice transportation i.e. PCM, G.711, G.723, Aurora, or any other known format (Oliver, col. 11 ll. 18-22, col. 15 ll. 31-32).

Farris, Bajwa and Oliver do not teach of automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate "valid" or "not valid"; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different call services); and responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris, Bajwa and Oliver to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to "monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 2, Farris teaches of the method wherein said server is accessible via a network outside said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1, item 23, IP is outside of network and is accessed via T1, SMDI or PRI; col. 11, ll. 10-20, ll. 42-54). Bajwa teaches of feature server accessible via network outside trusted telephone

network (Paragraph 0018-0020). Oliver teaches of accessing authentication server outside trusted telephone network (col. 4 ll. 30-36).

Regarding claim 3, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

retrieving a caller profile for said authenticated caller identity (col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID which is used to load specific subscriber service profile); and

specifying a selection of services from among a plurality of services that are offered for said call according to said caller profile (col. 20, ll. 33-49, variety of services selection based on profile).

Regarding claim 4, Farris teaches of the method wherein said authenticated caller identity is authenticated by a voice utterance of said caller (col. 19, ll. 26-40; col. 19, ll. 65-col. 20, ll. 5). Oliver teaches of authentication by voice utterance of the caller (col. 11 ll. 3-18).

Regarding claim 6, Farris teaches of the method wherein brokering a connection further comprises:

brokering a secure connection between said trusted telephone network and said external server (Fig. 1, SCP, STP, SSP and IP are connected by SS7, T1, PRI, SMDI etc. which are secure telephony networks as was known in the art).

Regarding claim 13, Farris teaches of a method for informing a callee of a caller identity, comprising:

detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 18, ll. 8-14);

brokering a connection between said origin device and an external server enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5, switch brokering connection between off hook line and IP), wherein brokering a connection further comprises:

transmitting a request for said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 16-40, SCP instructing IP);

transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway, to said origin device (col. 19, ll. 41-43);

transferring a voice utterance by said caller through said media gateway to said network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 43-46); and

receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (col. 20, ll. 14-22);

responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device, transferring said authenticated caller identity to a destination device, such that a callee receiving said call at said destination device is provided with an identity of a party originating said call (col. 20, ll. 6-32, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID; col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 28, terminating office receives and delivers caller ID to called party line).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant had relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals

(IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of a media gateway supporting Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), and also does not teach of automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 call received through central office); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); transmitting a request for

said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for accessing said external server (Paragraph 0018 gatekeeper signaling gateway to connect to external feature server for authentication); transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), to said origin device (Paragraph 0019 gateway transferring prompt from feature server to caller, Paragraph 0021 gateway supporting SIP); receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0023 validating caller); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) to provide various services based on user or user device authentication).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to "provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

The Applicant has argued that gateway in Bajwa does not transfer voice utterance by the caller. However, it was known in the art that media gateways were used to transfer voice or audio by converting between its coding protocols i.e. pulse code modulation (PCM) or analog voice for public switched telephone network (PSTN) from and/or to real time transport protocol (RTP) voice packet data for Internet.

However, in the same field of communication, Oliver teaches providing authentication service by connecting a device user in PSTN (Fig. 1 items 28, 30, col. 4 ll. 51-54, col. 16 ll. 14-24) to an external authentication server (AS) in Internet (Fig. 1 item 18, col. 4 ll. 21-27, ll. 30-36) through a media gateway (Fig. 1 items 10, 11, col. 4 ll. 37-51) that pass the voice data between PSTN and Internet (col. 4 ll. 61-col. 5 ll. 7, col. 5 ll. 21-38, ll. 49-52, col. 6 ll. 53-col. 7 ll. 8) for Biometric authentication by the authentication server (col. 8 ll. 48-col. 9 ll. 59, col. 11 ll. 23-48, server performing same functionality of verification and authentication as that by client device i.e. verify the identity of the current telephone user i.e. caller col. 11 ll. 3-18, ll. 40-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with a media gateway and external server arrangement to pass media from user device to the authentication server as taught by Oliver in order to support various coding schemes for voice transportation i.e. PCM, G.711, G.723, Aurora, or any other known format (Oliver, col. 11 ll. 18-22, col. 15 ll. 31-32).

Farris, Bajwa and Oliver do not teach of automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate "valid" or "not valid"); and responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris, Bajwa and Oliver to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to "monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 14, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity before transfer to said destination device (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 15, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to filtering preferences associated with said authenticated caller identity (col. 21, ll. 3-52, using

calling subscriber profile to provide name for caller identity instead of using it from LIDB).

Regarding claim 16, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to an identity of said callee (col. 22, ll. 28-51, filtering authenticated caller ID based on called party).

Regarding claim 17, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering said authenticated caller identity to block at least a portion of the content of said authenticated caller identity (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEMANT PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-8620. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hemant Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2614

/Hemant Patel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614